

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated September 28, 2004, claims 1-8 were rejected on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting, in view of commonly assigned US Patent No. 6,677,186. To remove the basis for these rejections, and thereby expedite the prosecution of the application, a Terminal Disclaimer is being filed herewith, together with a check for the requisite fee.

Claims 4-7 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly being indefinite. With respect to claims 4 and 7, the rejection states that the recitation of "a thermoplastic material loaded with metallic particles" is not clear. The basis for this rejection is not understood. The phrase is submitted to be clear on its face, as describing a thermoplastic material that contains metallic particles, to enable it to function as an antenna. At page 7, lines 12-19, the specification provides a specific example of such a material. If the rejection is maintained, the Examiner is respectfully requested to explain why the phrase is considered to be unclear, so that Applicant can address the particular issue of concern.

The rejection of claim 5 indicates that the phrase "a non-polymerized conductive material" is unclear. Again, the basis for this contention is not apparent. The claim recites a conductive material that is capable of being polymerized, but has not yet been put into its polymerized state. This embodiment is described in the specification at page 8, lines 15-26. Applicant repeats his request that, if the rejection is maintained, the Examiner explain what is considered to be unclear about the phrase, so that it can specifically addressed.

In connection with claim 6, the rejection states that the phrase "a moist conductive polymer material" is unclear. As described in the specification at page 9, lines 3-13, in this embodiment of the invention the antenna is produced from a conductive polymer material

that has not yet been dried. While still in its moist state, the material remains soft, so that it can flow as the protrusions on the chip are embedded into it. Thereafter, the conductive polymer material is dried, so that it hardens. Thus, the moist state is commensurate with a flowable state. In response to the rejection, claim 6 has been amended to clarify this point.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the grounds of rejection have been addressed, and that the claims are in condition for allowance.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: December 28, 2004

By:   
James A. LaBarre  
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620